



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

available, the other must be recognized and used even at the expense of readjusting the functions of the necessary connective, though that connective is ordinarily appropriated by the other method. This is what is done in Greek with *πρὶν* with the infinitive, however timid grammarians are in realizing the fact that their conjunction has here become an obvious preposition. Words of this diathesis are, as a rule, provisionally disposed of as adverbs, that part of speech being the catch-all of lost, strayed and stolen grammaticisms. *Praeter* with the Nominative seems to be so regarded by commentators and annotators; but no one has ever yet detected among the functions of the adverb the power to relate predications; and *praeter* followed by a Nominative must relate predications, the Nominative being the pendent subject of the second predication. As already hinted, there is no lack of instances to illustrate *as* followed by an Objective; but such instances are naturally condemned as negligences and ignorances, even though Cardinal Newman and Matthew Arnold confessed to prejudices in favor of the construction.

*Than* in *than whom* is a preposition, whether illegitimately or not; because *whom*, being a relative, involves a conjunction; and the relative admits no introductory conjunction except when two or more relative clauses are coördinately subordinated to the same antecedent, as is not the case in *than whom*, which is a single subordinate construction. *And* and *but* may coördinate two relational modifications to a common antecedent; in these cases, however, *and* and *but* really connect the repetitions of the main statement accompanied in each case by the respective relative clause. On the other hand, the *and* *which* construction, though it is coördinate in form, yet, as it attempts an unsymmetrical coördination with a mere adjective preceding, is still under the ban. Gould Brown's suspicions were aroused by the conjunctive character of the relative as repudiating the conjunctive supplement of *than*; but he does not appear to have understood the necessary consequences of his misgiving. *Than* cannot in *than whom* be a conjunction, because it is impossible to supply an antecedent for *who(m)* between *than* and *who(m)*, and no conjunction ever separates a relative from its antecedent; *than* certainly, in the traditional example, separates the relative *whom* from its intended antecedent *Beelzebub*, and hence it cannot be a conjunction. Moreover, the introduction of a new formal antecedent between *than* and *whom*, if it were possible, would create an impossible exigency by establishing the basis for a new predication that could not be completed, while it would fatally dislocate one already complete and consistent. The reason a conjunction never separates a relative from its antecedent is the same reason that prohibits a conjunction between a noun and its adjective-modifier.

Furthermore, after the conjunction *than* the clause must be such that, if *than* be omitted, the clause could stand alone as an independent sentence—a condition realized by *than* everywhere else, but impossible with *than who*. It is impossible here to complete any predication after *who*; but, even if it were not impossible, no relation could be established between such predication and the formal context.

I hope I have satisfactorily shown that *than who* is impossible grammatically and logically, and that *than whom* grammatically and logically shifts *than* to the category of prepositions, just as *save* has been shifted from the verb *via* the preposition into the conjunction. Of course, it still remains possible, for those who cannot make up their minds, to impound innocuous desuetude for the bookish phrase for which Milton's Latinism is usually held accountable, though Shakespeare far outdid him in "*than whom no mortal so magnificent*". How much farther back the phrase goes no one seems to know; but Swift, Prior, Bolingbroke and others are by Lowth cited in its illustration. Those who choose can justify *than me*, *than us*, etc., by the special analogy, though it can always be urged against them that these phrases lack the main defense of the relative combination. Some persons may wish to extend to *as* the same latitude of relation and the same adaptation of regimen; but, though *as* has some relative affinities, they are not of the kind to be cogent here. So far as *than whom* is concerned, I think the case must be closed by validating *than* as a preposition—a function plainly exemplified by the Latin and Greek equivalents, which being case-forms, are always prepositional and never conjunctive.

CASKIE HARRISON

The Latin School, Brooklyn, N Y

### The New Scholarship Patrons

We have the pleasure of announcing the following Scholarship Patrons (5 years) recently added to our list: Superintendent J L N Hunt, PhD, of New York; Principal James G Croswell of the Brearley School, New York; Dr James Cruikshank of P S 12, Brooklyn; Superintendent E E Whitney of Brooklyn.

### The New Leaflet Patrons

The following new Leaflet Patrons (5 years) have recently been added to our list: Dr J G Gulick of Brooklyn; Miss Hattie L McCartie of New York; Miss Sarah F Pellet, of Binghamton N Y; Mr H S Fuller of New York; Hon J R Howe of Brooklyn.

### The Second Meeting of The Latin Club

On Saturday, February 16, at 12 M sharp, in the Hotel Albert, corner of University Place and Eleventh Street, New York, will be held the second meeting of the New York Latin Club. Luncheon (50 cents a plate) will be served promptly at noon. This will be followed by Professor Sihler's address on "School, College and University". Adjournment at 2. Please send a postal card *now* to the Secretary, Mr A L Hodges, 36 East Twelfth Street, New York, stating your intention to be present.  
H F TOWLE, Acting President  
A L HODGES, Acting Secretary